



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/367,455	08/13/1999	Michael P. Daniels	54642USA1A	4367

7590 08/13/2002

Carolyn V Peters
3M Innovative Properties Company
PO Box 33427
St Paul, MN 55133-3427

EXAMINER

NILAND, PATRICK DENNIS

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1714

DATE MAILED: 08/13/2002

10

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/367,455

Applicant(s)

DANIELS ET AL.

Examiner

Patrick D. Niland

Art Unit

1714

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 May 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 1714

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Pat. No. 4569960 Blake.

Blake discloses a psa and method of making it which fall within the scope of the instant claims at the abstract; column 2, lines 42-68; column 3, lines 1-68; column 4, lines 1-18; column 7, lines 1-31; column 8, lines 1-31; the table of columns 11-12, particularly examples 73-75; and the patented claims. Applicant argues that anticipation requires identity of invention. The applicant has not shown that the psa of Blake is different than that of the instant claims. The applicant argues that the instantly claimed invention retains its "stick" properties, even in water. The instant claims recite "wet" but not wet with water. The applicant argues the definition of water dispersibility. The instant claims do not exclude water dispersibility. The examiner would point out that water dispersible resins are commonly applied to substrates in the form of the aqueous

Art Unit: 1714

dispersion, eg latex paints/adhesives. The substrate is necessarily wet in such applications and the resin still binds to the substrate. Thus, the reference water dispersible psa would have been expected to stick to wet substrates. The applicant provides no probative evidence to the contrary which is commensurate in scope with the instant claims and the cited prior art. The presumption made in the applicant's arguments is therefore not persuasive.

4. Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Pat. No. 4569960 Blake.

Blake discloses a psa and method of making it which fall within the scope of the instant claims at the abstract; column 2, lines 42-68; column 3, lines 1-68; column 4, lines 1-18; column 7, lines 1-31; column 8, lines 1-31; the table of columns 11-12, particularly examples 73-75; and the patented claims. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant invention to use the instantly claimed combinations of ingredients and amounts thereof in the psa of the patentee because they are encompassed by the patentee and would have been expected to give a psa having the properties of the psa of the patentee. The applicant argues that the instantly claimed invention retains its "stick" properties, even in water. The instant claims recite "wet" but not wet with water. The applicant argues the definition of water dispersibility. The instant claims do not exclude water dispersibility. The examiner would point out that water dispersible resins are commonly applied to substrates in the form of the aqueous dispersion, eg latex paints/adhesives. The substrate is necessarily wet in such applications and the resin still binds to the substrate. Thus, the reference water dispersible psa would have been expected to

Art Unit: 1714

stick to wet substrates. The applicant provides no probative evidence to the contrary which is commensurate in scope with the instant claims and the cited prior art. The presumption made in the applicant's arguments is therefore not persuasive.

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Patrick Niland whose telephone number is (703) 308-3510. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 9:30 to 6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vasu Jagannathan, can be reached on (703) 306-2777. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 305-5408.

Application/Control Number: 09/367455

Page 5

Art Unit: 1714

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

pn

Aug. 9, 2002

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Patrick Niland', is written over the printed name.

Patrick Niland
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1714